



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/058,379	01/30/2002	Stephen B. Weinstein	A8046	5854
7590 04/03/2008 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20037-3213				
EXAMINER PATEL, AJIT				
ART UNIT 2616		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/03/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/058,379

**Applicant(s)**

WEINSTEIN ET AL.

**Examiner**

AJIT G. PATEL

**Art Unit**

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed on 3/12/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 66-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 66-80 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12-15 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-11,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bender (of the record) in view of Robbins et al (of the record) and Patel et al (newly cited, U.S. Pub. 2006/0126536).

Regarding claims 1,11, Bender disclose a method and Apparatus for providing mobility within a network comprising a plurality of subnetworks (220 ---220N of fig. 2; see last four lines of para. 0043), each subnetwork comprising at least one network switch (see 280A of fig. 2); and at least one air access point (see 220A --- 220N of fig. 2) comprised of an air interface (330A --- 330N of fig. 3), an access control module (320 of fig. 3) and a router (350 of fig.3); at least one router (260 of fig. 2) that is connected to the network switch of each of the plurality of subnetworks. Bender does not specifically disclose at least one gateway router that is connected to the plurality of subnetworks. Robbins et al disclose method and apparatus for transparent internet mobility management comprising at least one gateway router that is connected to the plurality of subnetworks (see router in fig. 14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the gateway router as taught by Robbins et al in the system of Bender for routing the information. Bender and Robbins et al discloses all the limitation as described above except that the network uses MPLS (multiprotocol label switching) to route packet. Patel et al disclose a wireless network which uses MPLS (multiprotocol

label switching) to route packet (see para. 0068 and 0072). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use MPLS (multiprotocol label switching) to route packet as taught by Patel et al in the combined system of Bender and Robbins et al in order to facilitate communications.

Regarding claim 2, Robbins et al disclose the limitation "wherein the gateway router is coupled to a mobile telephone network" (par.0029,0030)

Regarding claim 3, Bender discloses all the claimed subject matter as described in previous paragraph except that the gateway router is connected to PSTN network (122 of fig. 2)

Regarding claims 4,5, Robbins et al disclose the limitation "wherein the gateway router is coupled to a network operated by a service provider which is a virtual operator" (WAN I/F Router is connected ISP service provider in fig. 14, para. 0029).

Regarding claims 6,7,9, Bender disclose the limitation "wherein a server having a data base of mobile subscriber public keys is coupled to the network operated by the service provider and the access control module authenticates a mobile subscriber that is accessing the wireless network by requesting subscriber public keys stored in the database" (270 of fig. 2).

Regarding claim 8, Robbins et al disclose a gateway router but fail to disclose a plurality gateway router. However, to connect a plurality of gateway routers would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to route the packet from one network to another network. Regarding claim 10, Robbins et al disclose the limitation "wherein a mobile subscriber is

Art Unit: 2616

assigned an IP address dynamically when the mobile subscriber access the wireless network" (para. 0051).

Regarding claim 16, Patel et al disclose wherein tunnels based on multiprotocol label switching are provided between the at least one gateway router and the air access point in at least one of the subnetworks (para. 0072). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use MPLS in the system of Bender and Robins et al to facilitate communications.

3. . Claims 12-15,17,66-88 are allowed.
4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11,16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AJIT G. PATEL whose telephone number is 571-272-3140. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY- FRIDAY.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on 571-272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/AJIT G. PATEL/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2616